

REMARKS

Applicants have amended Claim 1 hereto, to incorporate the limitations of Claim 2.

Further, each of Claims 4 and 5 now recites that the top surface of each ribbon bears a reflective layer, each of which reflective layer exhibits the same degree of reflectivity. This is set forth in the specification, see page 9, lines 6-15.

Applicants note that the claims have been modified not with regard to significant scope, but to distinguish them from claims of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/029,875 (see Item 1 of the outstanding Office Action). As an interference is anticipated, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, so that both cases may be appropriately added to the interference, if necessary.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Applicants respond herewith to the rejections in the Office Action of July 22, 2003.

Withdrawal is respectfully requested, in light of the Amendment submitted herewith, and the arguments advanced below.

This application has been amended to add Akira Tomita, whose omission from the inventive entity of this application was inadvertent. Accordingly, as the inventorship is now identical with the inventorship in parent application U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/029,875, rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) and (g) thereover are resolved. Further, as the claims are no longer identical, a rejection for same invention type double patenting is overcome. Without admission, one way or the other, as to the question of obviousness, Applicants submit herewith a Terminal Disclaimer, disclaiming that period of enforceability of any patent to issue on the above-captioned patent application extending beyond that of any patent to issue on parent application U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 10/029,875.

Moreover, Applicants have amended Claim 10 to depend correctly from Claim 9, thereby addressing the issue of proper antecedent basis.

In light of the above amendments, and the terminal disclaimer submitted herewith, withdrawal of the rejections and objections at Items 1-5, pages 2-3 of the outstanding Office Action is respectfully requested.

Rejection Over Prior Art

All claims stand rejected as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,169,624, with which Applicants have requested declaration of an interference. Although the rejection is advanced pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102(e), Applicants note that the subject matter claimed is not patentably distinct from the subject matter in certain of the claims of U.S. Patent 6,169,624, and, pursuant to the Statement in Item 1 of the outstanding Office Action, the rejection may lie under 35 U.S.C.

§102(g), as well.

Applicants claims also stand rejected as anticipated or obvious over U.S. Patent 6,233,087, Hawkins, et al. (Hawkins, taken alone, or in view of U.S. Patent 5,311,360).

In response to both rejections, Applicants note that the effective date of U.S. Patent 6,169,624 is August 11, 1999 and that of U.S. Patent 6,233,087, Hawkins is December 18, 1998.

Applicants submit herewith the Declaration of the inventors, pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §1.608(b), and the corroborating Declaration of Joe Berger, Vice-President of Engineering, Silicon Light Machine of Cypress Semiconductor Corporation, throughout the period of the making of the invention. Accordingly, Applicants have established a date of invention in advance of either reference, and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as well as for obviousness, is respectfully requested. Upon withdrawal, in order to contest priority, a declaration of interference between the above-captioned patent application and U.S. Patent 6,169,624 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICK LLP



Steven B. Kelber
Registration No. 30,073
Attorney of Record

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412
Telephone No. (202) 861-3900
Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085